

REMARKS:

Claims 38,42,45, and 59-72 have been cancelled. Claims 73-106 have been added. The abstract has been amended for better form and to correct a clerical error.

Examiner would allow claims 63 and 71, if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have therefore added claims 100 and 95, which are substantially similar to claims 63 and 71, respectively, except for changes to include all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims and also changes to remove the language related to the comparator circuit section. It is believed that removing this unnecessary language will not affect the patentability of these claims.

Minor editorial changes have also been made to these claims from that of their respective claims 63 and 71. In particular, in claim 100 the phrase "moisture sensor" has been changed to "first sensor", the phrase "control signal" has been changed to "first control signal" and the phrase "floor surface" has been changed to "cleaning surface". In claim 95, the phrase "that distributes cleaning solution on a surface and substantially simultaneously extracts the cleaning solution along with the dirt on the surface in a continuous operation" has been removed. The changes were not intended to narrow the scope of claims. Also, these changes will not affect the patentability of these claims. Thus, these claims should be allowed. Also, claims 101 and 102, which depend from claim 100, and claims 96 and 97, which depend from claim 95 should be allowed.

Examiner would allow claims 64 and 72, if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have therefore added claims 103 and 98, which are substantially similar to claims 64 and 72, respectively, except for changes to include all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. Minor editorial changes have also been made to these claims from that of their respective claims 64 and 72. In particular, in claim 103 the phrase "moisture sensor" has been changed to "first sensor", the phrase "control signal" has been changed to "first control signal" and the phrase "floor surface" has been changed to "cleaning surface". In claim 98, the phrase "that distributes cleaning solution on a surface and substantially simultaneously extracts the cleaning solution along with the dirt on the surface in a continuous operation" has been removed. The changes were **not** intended to narrow the scope of claims. Also, these changes will not affect the patentability of these claims. Thus, these claims should be allowed. Also, claim 104, which depends from claim 103, and claim 99, which depends from claim 98, should be allowed.

Claims 73-79 have been added which are substantially similar to claims 38,42,45, and 59-62, respectively, except for some minor editorial changes. In particular, the phrase "moisture sensor" has been changed to "first sensor", the phrase "control signal" has been changed to "first control signal" and the phrase "floor surface" has been changed to "cleaning surface". The changes were **not** intended to narrow the scope of claims. Also, these changes will not affect the patentability of these claims. The Examiner has rejected claims 38,42,45, and 59-62 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being

unpatentable over Kasper et. al. '302 in view of Kasper et al. '587 and Yoo. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The combination of Kasper '302 with Kasper '587 and Yoo is traversed. There is no basis for making the proposed combination. There is no suggestion as to how the pressure sensor and related circuit in the Yoo reference could be incorporated into the Kasper '302 and Kasper '587 references. Further, applicant hereby submits a copy of the affidavit, which was submitted to overcome the cited Kasper '302 reference for the applicant's parent patent application having serial number 09/648,204. See the attached §1.131 affidavit. Applicants believe that the reference is not prior art as the applicants can show conception prior to the earliest filing date of 6,446,302. Hence, this combination is not proper and should be withdrawn. Therefore, claims 73-79 and also newly added claims 105 and 106, which depend from claim 73, should be allowed.

Dependent claim 105 should be allowed for at least the same reason as claim 73 and it further includes the limitation with respect to the circuit including a microprocessor coupled to the first sensor and the second sensor.

Dependent claim 106 should be allowed for at least the same reason as claim 105 and it further includes the limitation with respect to the microprocessor being mounted to a printed circuit board.

Claims 80 and 81 have been added which are substantially similar to claims 69 and 70, respectively, except for the some minor editorial changes. In particular, the phrase "that distributes cleaning solution on a surface and substantially simultaneously extracts the cleaning solution along with the dirt

on the surface in a continuous operation" has been removed. The changes were **not** intended to narrow the scope of claims. Also, these changes will not affect the patentability of these claims. The Examiner has rejected claims 69 and 70 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Kasper et. al. '302 in view of Kasper et al. '587 and Yoo. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The combination of Kasper '302 with Kasper '587 and Yoo is traversed. There is no basis for making the proposed combination. There is no suggestion as to how the pressure sensor and related circuit in the Yoo reference could be incorporated into the Kasper '302 and Kasper '587 references. Also, there is no indicating device or lamp responsive to the control signal for indicating when the liquid of the tank reaches a predetermined level.

Further, applicant hereby submits a copy of the affidavit, which was submitted to overcome the cited Kasper '302 reference for the applicant's parent patent application having serial number 09/648,204. See the attached §1.131 affidavit. Applicants believe that the reference is not prior art as the applicants can show conception prior to the earliest filing date of 6,446,302. Hence, this combination is not proper and should be withdrawn. Therefore, claims 80 and 81 and also newly added claims 82-84, which depend from claim 81, should be allowed.

Dependent claim 82 should be allowed for at least the same reason as claim 81 and it further includes the limitation with respect to the circuit including a microprocessor for outputting the control signal.

Dependent claim 83 should be allowed for at least the same reason as claim 81 and it further includes the limitation with respect to the suction

cleaner including a base for movement along a surface, a handle pivotally connected to the base, and the recovery tank being removably mounted to one of the handle and the base.

Dependent claim 84 should be allowed for at least the same reason as claim 81 and it further includes the limitation with respect to the suction cleaner including a solution tank for holding cleaning solution, a distributor fluidly connected to the solution tank for distributing the cleaning solution on the surface.

Claims 85-94 have been added to state additional patentable subject matter which distinguish over the prior art of record and therefore should be allowed.

It is believed that the original and newly entered claims distinguish over the prior art of record. Examination and early allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JAY M. SALEM ET ET. AL.

By: Brett A. Schenck

Brett A. Schenck
Reg. No. 35,347

Brett A. Schenck

THE HOOVER COMPANY
Patent Department
101 East Maple Street
North Canton, OH 44720

Phone: (330) 499-9200, Ext. 2515